

INDEPENDENT REVIEWERS OF TEXAS, INC.

4100 West Eldorado Pkwy' Suite 100 -373 . McKinney, Texas 75070
Office 469-218-1010 . Toll Free Fax 469-374-6852 e-mail: independentreviewers@hotmail.com

Notice of Independent Review Decision

[Date notice sent to all parties]:

07/25/2013

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE: APPEAL: 10 sessions of outpatient Work Hardening Program for the lumbar spine at Injury 1 as requested

A DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH PHYSICIAN OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER WHO REVIEWED THE DECISION: Board Certified Chiropractic Examiner

REVIEW OUTCOME:

Upon independent review, the reviewer finds that the previous adverse determination/adverse determinations should be:

Upheld (Agree)

Provide a description of the review outcome that clearly states whether medical necessity exists for each of the health care services in dispute.

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW:

Functional capacity evaluation dated 04/30/13
Initial behavioral medicine assessment dated 04/30/13
Plan and goals of treatment regarding the work hardening program dated 06/03/13
Initial work hardening program evaluation dated 06/04/13
Progress report dated 06/05/13
Clinical note dated 06/24/13
Previous utilization reviews dated 01/18/13, 01/23/13, & 06/24/13

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

The patient is a female who reported an injury regarding her lumbar region. The functional capacity evaluation dated 04/30/13 details the patient able to demonstrate a light physical demand level. However, the patient's occupation requires a medium physical demand level. The behavioral assessment note dated 04/30/13 details the patient describing a stabbing sensation in the low back. The patient rated her pain as 6-8/10. The note does detail the patient having undergone a battery of psychological exams. The patient's BAI score was noted to be 22 indicating moderate levels of anxiety. The patient's BDI-2 details the patient scored a 31 indicating severe depression. The clinical note dated 06/03/13

details the patient being recommended for a work hardening program. The note does detail the patient having exhausted all conservative treatments. The initial work hardening program evaluation dated 06/04/13 details the patient being recommended for a work hardening program in order to increase the patient's physical and functional tolerance and to facilitate a safe return to work. The clinical note dated 06/05/13 details the patient utilizing pharmacological interventions to include Lidoderm, Meloxicam, and Robaxin for ongoing pain relief. The clinical note dated 06/24/13 details the patient complaining of ongoing low back pain. The patient stated the initial injury occurred when she was working as a cashier and a coworker fell down next to her. In attempting to catch the coworker, the patient twisted and felt immediate low back pain. The note does detail the patient having completed 12 sessions of physical therapy to date.

The previous utilization review dated 06/24/13 details the patient's request for a 10 day course of a work hardening program resulting in a denial.

ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION:

The documentation submitted for review elaborates the patient complaining of ongoing low back pain. A work hardening program would be indicated provided the patient meets specific criteria to include completion of all conservative measures. The documentation does detail the patient having previously undergone 12 physical therapy sessions; however, no therapy notes were submitted for review indicating an improvement followed by a plateau response. Additionally, the patient is noted to have severe findings of depression. No information was submitted regarding the patient's completion of a full course of psychological treatments addressing the depression. Given that no information was submitted regarding the patient's response to the previous physical therapy and taking into account that no information was submitted regarding the patient's psychological treatments, this request does not meet guideline recommendations. As such, it is the opinion of the reviewer that the request for 10 sessions of outpatient Work Hardening Program for the lumbar spine is not recommended as medically necessary.

IRO REVIEWER REPORT TEMPLATE -WC

A DESCRIPTION AND THE SOURCE OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA OR OTHER CLINICAL BASIS USED TO MAKE THE DECISION:

MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE, AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS

ODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT GUIDELINES
Criteria for admission to a Work Hardening (WH) Program:
(1) Prescription: The program has been recommended by a physician or nurse case manager, and a prescription has been provided.
(2) Screening Documentation: Approval of the program should include evidence of a screening evaluation. This multidisciplinary examination should include the following components: (a) History including demographic information, date and description of injury, history of previous injury, diagnosis/diagnoses, work status before the injury, work status after the injury, history of treatment for the injury (including medications),

history of previous injury, current employability, future employability, and time off work; (b) Review of systems including other non work-related medical conditions; (c) Documentation of musculoskeletal, cardiovascular, vocational, motivational, behavioral, and cognitive status by a physician, chiropractor, or physical and/or occupational therapist (and/or assistants); (d) Diagnostic interview with a mental health provider; (e) Determination of safety issues and accommodation at the place of work injury. Screening should include adequate testing to determine if the patient has attitudinal and/or behavioral issues that are appropriately addressed in a multidisciplinary work hardening program. The testing should also be intensive enough to provide evidence that there are no psychosocial or significant pain behaviors that should be addressed in other types of programs, or will likely prevent successful participation and return-to-employment after completion of a work hardening program. Development of the patient's program should reflect this assessment.

(3) Job demands: A work-related musculoskeletal deficit has been identified with the addition of evidence of physical, functional, behavioral, and/or vocational deficits that preclude ability to safely achieve current job demands. These job demands are generally reported in the medium or higher demand level (i.e., not clerical/sedentary work). There should generally be evidence of a valid mismatch between documented, specific essential job tasks and the patient's ability to perform these required tasks (as limited by the work injury and associated deficits).

(4) Functional capacity evaluations (FCEs): A valid FCE should be performed, administered and interpreted by a licensed medical professional. The results should indicate consistency with maximal effort, and demonstrate capacities below an employer verified physical demands analysis (PDA). Inconsistencies and/or indication that the patient has performed below maximal effort should be addressed prior to treatment in these programs.

(5) Previous PT: There is evidence of treatment with an adequate trial of active physical rehabilitation with improvement followed by plateau, with evidence of no likely benefit from continuation of this previous treatment. Passive physical medicine modalities are not indicated for use in any of these approaches.

(6) Rule out surgery: The patient is not a candidate for whom surgery, injections, or other treatments would clearly be warranted to improve function (including further diagnostic evaluation in anticipation of surgery).

(7) Healing: Physical and medical recovery sufficient to allow for progressive reactivation and participation for a minimum of 4 hours a day for three to five days a week.

(8) Other contraindications: There is no evidence of other medical, behavioral, or other comorbid conditions (including those that are non work-related) that prohibits participation in the program or contradicts successful return-to-work upon program completion.

(9) RTW plan: A specific defined return-to-work goal or job plan has been established, communicated and documented. The ideal situation is that there is a plan agreed to by the employer and employee. The work goal to which the employee should return must have demands that exceed the claimant's current validated abilities.

(10) Drug problems: There should be documentation that the claimant's medication

regimen will not prohibit them from returning to work (either at their previous job or new employment). If this is the case, other treatment options may be required, for example a program focused on detoxification.

(11) Program documentation: The assessment and resultant treatment should be documented and be available to the employer, insurer, and other providers. There should be documentation of the proposed benefit from the program (including functional, vocational, and psychological improvements) and the plans to undertake this improvement. The assessment should indicate that the program providers are familiar with the expectations of the planned job, including skills necessary. Evidence of this may include site visitation, videotapes or functional job descriptions.

(12) Further mental health evaluation: Based on the initial screening, further evaluation by a mental health professional may be recommended. The results of this evaluation may suggest that treatment options other than these approaches may be required, and all screening evaluation information should be documented prior to further treatment planning.

(13) Supervision: Supervision is recommended under a physician, chiropractor, occupational therapist, or physical therapist with the appropriate education, training and experience. This clinician should provide on-site supervision of daily activities, and participate in the initial and final evaluations. They should design the treatment plan and be in charge of changes required. They are also in charge of direction of the staff.

(14) Trial: Treatment is not supported for longer than 1-2 weeks without evidence of patient compliance and demonstrated significant gains as documented by subjective and objective improvement in functional abilities. Outcomes should be presented that reflect the goals proposed upon entry, including those specifically addressing deficits identified in the screening procedure. A summary of the patient's physical and functional activities performed in the program should be included as an assessment of progress.

(15) Concurrently working: The patient who has been released to work with specific restrictions may participate in the program while concurrently working in a restricted capacity, but the total number of daily hours should not exceed 8 per day while in treatment.

(16) Conferences: There should be evidence of routine staff conferencing regarding progress and plans for discharge. Daily treatment activity and response should be documented.

(17) Voc rehab: Vocational consultation should be available if this is indicated as a significant barrier. This would be required if the patient has no job to return to.

(18) Post-injury cap: The worker must be no more than 2 years past date of injury. Workers that have not returned to work by two-years post injury generally do not improve from intensive work hardening programs. If the worker is greater than one-year post injury a comprehensive multidisciplinary program may be warranted if there is clinical suggestion of psychological barrier to recovery (but these more complex programs may also be justified as early as 8-12 weeks, see Chronic pain programs).

(19) Program timelines: These approaches are highly variable in intensity, frequency and duration. APTA, AOTA and utilization guidelines for individual jurisdictions may be inconsistent. In general, the recommendations for use of such programs will fall

within the following ranges: These approaches are necessarily intensive with highly variable treatment days ranging from 4-8 hours with treatment ranging from 3-5 visits per week. The entirety of this treatment should not exceed 20 full-day visits over 4 weeks, or no more than 160 hours (allowing for part-day sessions if required by part-time work, etc., over a longer number of weeks). A reassessment after 1-2 weeks should be made to determine whether completion of the chosen approach is appropriate, or whether treatment of greater intensity is required.

(20) Discharge documentation: At the time of discharge the referral source and other predetermined entities should be notified. This may include the employer and the insurer. There should be evidence documented of the clinical and functional status, recommendations for return to work, and recommendations for follow-up services. Patient attendance and progress should be documented including the reason(s) for termination including successful program completion or failure. This would include noncompliance, declining further services, or limited potential to benefit. There should also be documentation if the patient is unable to participate due to underlying medical conditions including substance dependence.

(21) Repetition: Upon completion of a rehabilitation program (e.g., work conditioning, work hardening, outpatient medical rehabilitation, or chronic pain/functional restoration program) neither re-enrollment in nor repetition of the same or similar rehabilitation program is medically warranted for the same condition or injury.